

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 QUILLIE L. HARVEY, JR.,) Case No. 09cv0150-LAB (BLM)
12)
13 Petitioner,)
14 v.) **ORDER DENYING WITHOUT**
15 A. HEDGPETH, Warden, et al.,) **PREJUDICE PETITIONER'S MOTION**
16) **FOR ASSIGNMENT OF COUNSEL**
17) **[Doc. No. 7]**
18 Respondents.)
19)
20)
21)
22)
23)
24)
25)
26)
27)
28)

17 On February 9, 2009, Petitioner Quillie Harvey, Jr., a state
18 prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, filed the Motion for
19 Assignment of Counsel currently before the Court. Doc. No. 7.
20 Petitioner contends that he requires appointed counsel because of the
21 seriousness of his case and because he "has very little legal experience
22 and knowledge of law." *Id.* at 3. Petitioner also claims that the
23 prison lockdown and his limited access to the prison library have
24 impaired his ability to prepare his case. *Id.* at 8. Having considered
25 the request submitted by Petitioner and the applicable law, and for the
26 reasons set forth below, Petitioner's Motion for Assignment of Counsel
27 is **DENIED** without prejudice.
28

28 ///

1 The Sixth Amendment right to counsel does not extend to federal
2 habeas corpus actions by state prisoners. See McClesky v. Zant, 499
3 U.S. 467, 495 (1991); Nevius v. Sumner, 105 F.3d 453, 460 (9th Cir.
4 1996) (noting that there currently exists no constitutional right to
5 appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings); Chaney v. Lewis, 801 F.2d
6 1191, 1196 (9th Cir. 1986). However, courts may appoint counsel for
7 financially eligible habeas petitioners seeking relief pursuant to 28
8 U.S.C. § 2254 where "the interests of justice so require." 18 U.S.C.
9 § 3006A(a)(2)(B); Chaney, 801 F.2d at 1196. Whether or not to appoint
10 counsel is a matter left to the court's discretion, unless an
11 evidentiary hearing is necessary. See Knaubert v. Goldsmith, 791 F.2d
12 722, 728-30 (9th Cir. 1986) (explaining that the interests of justice
13 require appointment of counsel when the court conducts an evidentiary
14 hearing on the petition).

15 The court's discretion to appoint counsel may be exercised only
16 under "exceptional circumstances." Terrell v. Brewer, 935 F.2d 1015,
17 1017 (9th Cir. 1991). "A finding of exceptional circumstances requires
18 an evaluation of both the 'likelihood of success on the merits and the
19 ability of the petitioner to articulate his claims *pro se* in light of
20 the complexity of the legal issues involved.' Neither of these factors
21 is dispositive and both must be viewed together before reaching a
22 decision." Id. (quoting Wilborn v. Escalderon, 789 F.2d 1328, 1331 (9th
23 Cir. 1986)).

24 The Court has reviewed the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus
25 submitted by Petitioner in this case. Doc. No. 1. This filing belies
26 Petitioner's claims of an inability to understand the applicable law.
27 For example, in his Petition, Petitioner properly articulated a claim of
28 ineffective assistance of counsel under the Sixth Amendment. See id.

1 Petitioner provides a thorough and clear recitation of his claims, and
2 cites appropriate authority.¹ See id. Thus, the Court finds that
3 Petitioner not only has a sufficient grasp of his individual claims for
4 habeas relief and the issues involved in those claims, but also is able
5 to articulate those claims adequately without assistance. See LaMere v.
6 Risley, 827 F.2d 622, 626 (9th Cir. 1987) (affirming district court's
7 denial of request for appointment of counsel where pleadings
8 demonstrated petitioner had "a good understanding of the issues and the
9 ability to present forcefully and coherently his contentions"). The
10 Court also finds that while Petitioner has asserted sufficient facts to
11 state a claim for federal habeas relief, he has not established a
12 likelihood of success on the merits. See Terrell, 935 F.2d at 1017.
13 Under these circumstances, the Court concludes that this habeas
14 proceeding does not present "exceptional circumstances" justifying the
15 appointment of legal counsel. Id. Accordingly, Petitioner's Motion for
16 Assignment of Counsel is **DENIED** without prejudice.

17 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

18 DATED: February 23, 2009

19 

20 BARBARA L. MAJOR
21 United States Magistrate Judge
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 ¹ Because of Petitioner's demonstrated ability to cite proper authority and clearly present his claims, the Court finds that the prison lockdown and his limited library access have not impaired Petitioner's ability to litigate this case thus far.